

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

In re JUAN C., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JUAN C.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F068611

(Super. Ct. No. JJD067305)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Tulare County. Hugo Loza, Temporary Judge. (Pursuant to Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21.)

Kristen Owen, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Plaintiff and Appellant.

Office of the State Attorney General, Sacramento, California, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Detjen, Acting P.J., Peña, J. and Sarkisian, J.†

† Judge of the Superior Court of Fresno County, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.

It was alleged in a juvenile wardship petition that appellant, Juan C., a minor, committed theft by acquiring or retaining possession of access card account information, with intent to defraud (Pen. Code, § 484e, subd. (d)), a felony. The petition was subsequently amended to allege, instead, a single count of petty theft (Pen. Code, §§ 484, 488), a misdemeanor. Appellant admitted that allegation, and at the subsequent disposition hearing, the juvenile court adjudged appellant a ward of the court, placed him on formal probation and ordered, inter alia, that he reside in the custody of his parents and that he pay victim restitution in the amount of \$867.39.

Appellant's appointed appellate counsel has filed an opening brief which summarizes the pertinent facts, with citations to the record, raises no issues, and asks that this court independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Appellant has not responded to this court's invitation to submit additional briefing. We affirm.

According to the report of the probation officer, records of the Porterville Police Department indicate the following. The victim is appellant's uncle. The victim told police that appellant had been using his bank card to make online purchases without his (the victim's) permission. Appellant, when confronted by his uncle, admitted to making several unauthorized purchases online. The victim estimated his total loss to be \$867.39.

Following independent review of the record, we have concluded that no reasonably arguable legal or factual issues exist.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.